

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 818

HE 029 863

AUTHOR MacFarland, Thomas W.
TITLE Students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. Research and Planning Report 96-12.
INSTITUTION Nova Southeastern Univ., Fort Lauderdale, FL.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Demography; Distance Education; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Quality; *Extension Education; *Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *On Campus Students; Program Evaluation; Satisfaction; School Choice; *Schools of Education; *Student Surveys; Technology; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Nova Southeastern University FL

ABSTRACT

This study examined student satisfaction among a sample of on-campus and off-campus students of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education at Nova Southeastern University. A total of 1,039 students responded to a survey that focused on demographic and background information, academic programs, and student services. The study found that 80 percent of on-campus students were enrolled in either a master's or specialist program, while nearly two-thirds of all off-campus students were enrolled in doctoral programs. Overall quality of the academic program received a slightly higher rating from off-campus students than from on-campus students, with off-campus respondents providing higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts for approximately two-thirds of all survey statements. On-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction than off-campus students for statements related to the university's technology-based information resource infrastructure. Over 20 percent of all respondents indicated that they would not have attended a college or university if they had not attended NSU. A copy of the survey questionnaire is appended. (Contains 15 references.) (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

1	9
9	6

ED 403 818

STUDENTS IN THE ABRAHAM S. FISCHLER CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION RESPOND TO A SATISFACTION SURVEY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS AND OFF- CAMPUS STUDENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

AUGUST 1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas W. MacFarland

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**STUDENTS IN THE ABRAHAM S. FISCHLER CENTER FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION RESPOND TO A
SATISFACTION SURVEY: A COMPARISON
BETWEEN ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS
AND OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS**

Thomas W. MacFarland

Senior Research Associate

**Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning**

August 1996

**Research and Planning
Report 96-12**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was prepared to assess levels of satisfaction with program and services for students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education who were enrolled during Winter Term 1996. Previous activities had focused on a broad assessment of students from all five academic centers with off-campus offerings (N = 12,499). Site personnel returned 1,039 useable surveys to Research and Planning (On-campus N = 707, Off-campus N = 322, and Unidentified Place of Attendance N = 10) from the population of 4,918 Center for the Advancement of Education students.

Attention was directed to differences between levels of satisfaction from students who attended the majority of their classes on the University's Davie Campus and the immediate Broward County area (on-campus students) and their counterparts who attended the majority of their classes at other locations (off-campus students). Although these comparisons serve as a useful differentiation between on-campus students and off-campus students, it should be recalled that there are multiple sources of data in the University's *Master Plan* (1995) and *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996) that provide additional information on the practice and efficacy of distance education at the University.

Survey statements were worded using language directly from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996). All statements received a mean rating of 3.0 or greater (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services. For approximately two-thirds of all survey statements, off-campus students provided higher mean ratings than on-campus students.

Comparison of results between on-campus students and off-campus students confirmed the assumption that the University needed to initiate a series of activities to increase access to the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure for off-campus students. Along with the planned University-wide expenditure of \$1.5 million for computing equipment in Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997, a brief listing of proactive measures that are currently in place that should raise student satisfaction with the information infrastructure to even higher levels was identified.

HIGHLIGHTS

Identification of the Population

- This study represented a broad assessment of students in Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education, including students attending class in Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Delaware, and Canada.
- Approximately 80 percent of all on-campus respondents were enrolled in either a master's or specialist program. In contrast, nearly two-thirds of all off-campus respondents were enrolled in a doctoral program.

Purpose of This Report

- Along with a request for demographic and marketing information, respondents were queried on their level of satisfaction with issues linked to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996).
- All statements received a rating of 3.0 or greater (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services.
- The summative statement **Overall quality of this academic program** received a higher rating from off-campus respondents (Mean = 4.3) than their on-campus counterparts (Mean = 4.0).

Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

Approximately 40 percent of all off-campus respondents and 30 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated experience with electronic mail as a technology-based instructional medium.

Reasons for Selecting the University

- For on-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
 - Type of Programs Available 54.3 percent
 - Convenience 53.5 percent
 - Location 46.0 percent
- For off-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
 - Convenience 65.5 percent
 - Type of Programs Available 61.5 percent
 - Location 50.9 percent
- Over 20 percent of all on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents did not select attendance at a college or university as an option had they not attended Nova Southeastern University.

Satisfaction with Program and Services

- Off-campus respondents provided higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts for approximately two-thirds of all survey statements, including statements related to: instructional methods, delivery system, competency of the faculty, quality of the learning environment, opportunity for intellectual growth, faculty and student interaction, exposure to research scholars, and opportunity for peer interaction.
- On-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction than off-campus students for statements related to the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure. Processes that are currently in place to increase off-campus access to this information infrastructure were identified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
HIGHLIGHTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of This Study	1
METHODOLOGY	2
Survey Development	2
Sampling	3
Population and Invited Sample	3
Responding Sample	4
RESULTS	5
Demographic Composition of the Responding Sample	5
Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media	5
Satisfaction With the University	6
Academic Programs and Student Services	6

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
DISCUSSION	15
SUMMARY	17
REFERENCES	18
APPENDIX	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Degree Level	7
2	Gender	7
3	Ethnicity	8
4	Majority Place of Class Attendance	8
5	Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media	9
6	Frequency of Response to Reasons for Attending Nova Southeastern University	10
7	Frequency of Response to What Survey Respondents Would Have Done if They had not Attended Nova Southeastern University	11
8	Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs And Student Services	12

INTRODUCTION

Background

The University initially offered off-campus degree programs in 1972, when the field-based Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership and the field-based Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty and Administrators were first implemented. These and other off-campus degree programs were integral degree offerings when the University received reaffirmation of accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1975 and 1985 (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book*; 1996, p. 9-11). The University currently offers off-campus programs at 79 sites in Florida, 66 sites in 21 other states in the United States, and 13 sites in five foreign nations (*Off-Campus Program Directory*, 1996).

As part of the current process for reaffirmation of accreditation, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools assembled a Visiting Team at the University in February 1996. This Visiting Team received orientation from University administrators on a variety of issues, including orientation on current distance education activities at the University. Members of this Visiting Team met with students, faculty, and staff at selected off-campus sites throughout Winter Term 1996. These on-site visits were planned to provide an advance framework for the full Visiting Team's presence at the University in October 1996.

Purpose of This Study

Extending the evaluations contained in annual reports, such as *Quality Improvement Plans, Administrative and Educational Support Services: 1994-95* (1995) and *Status Report on Institutional Effectiveness: 1994 - 1995* (1995), Research and Planning in cooperation with those centers most involved with distance education prepared a plan (Memorandum from Tom MacFarland to John Losak; September 22, 1995) to survey both students and graduates as reflected in the following reports:

- Research and Planning Report 96-02; *Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us About Their Undergraduate Experience.*
- Research and Planning Report 96-03; *Place of Class Attendance at Nova Southeastern University: Calendar Years 1990 to 1994.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-05; *Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
- Research and Planning Report 96-06; *Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experiences.*
- Research and Planning Report 96-07; *Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
- Research and Planning Report 96-08; *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey.*

Although these reports provide useful analyses, it should be recalled that there are multiple sources of data in the University's *Master Plan* (1995) and *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996) that provide additional information on the practice and efficacy of distance education at the University.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Development

Survey development was described in full detail in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996). Most demographic selections and marketing-type statements in the survey (Appendix) are specific to the University and these selections were tested in prior survey activities initiated by Research and Planning. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996) and *Guidelines for Planning Distance Learning Activities* (1992) served as major references for the development of most Likert-type survey statements.

Sampling

Population and Invited Sample

The population for the entire survey process consisted of all Winter Term 1996 students enrolled in the five academic centers with distance education programs (N = 12,499; Research and Planning *Weekly Enrollment Report*, April 29, 1996). With specific reference to the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education (N = 4,918; Research

and Planning *Weekly Enrollment Report*, April 29, 1996), site administrators at the following locations were instructed to distribute the survey instrument to students sometime between March 25 to April 25, 1996, depending on local cluster meeting dates:

- Florida

- Orlando

Graduate Teacher Education Program (M.S. and Ed.S.) N = 175

- Tampa

Graduate Teacher Education Program (M.S. and Ed.S.) N = 175

- Other States

- Atlanta, Georgia

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 29

- Kansas City, Missouri

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 7

- Northern Virginia

Child and Youth Studies (Ed.D.) N = 21

- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 39

- Phoenix, Arizona

Higher Education (Ed.D.) N = 32

- Richmond, Virginia

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 26

Higher Education (Ed.D.) N = 38

- Williamsport, Pennsylvania

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 9

▫ Wilmington, Delaware

Child and Youth Studies (Ed.D.) N = 17
 Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 18

■ International

▫ Canada (Vancouver)

Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) N = 20

TOTAL N = 606

The invited sample was expanded in May 1996 to include all students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education attending class, during Winter Term 1996, either at the University's Davie Campus or at local clusters in Broward County (N = 1,325).

Responding Sample

Site personnel in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education returned 1,039 useable surveys to Research and Planning:

■ On-campus N = 707
 ■ Off-campus N = 322
 ■ Unidentified N = 10

A limitation to this study was that it is not possible to accurately determine the percentage of survey return. During survey distribution and return, there were cases where the total number of surveys distributed to students and the completed number of surveys in each packet were not accurately recorded. Although it is not possible to offer a calculation of return percentage, it is reasonable to think that the return percentage is high, since survey completion was an in-class activity, administered by instructors and site personnel.

RESULTS

Demographic Composition of the Responding Sample

Tables 1 to 4 provide demographic information about the responding sample. In regard to contrasts between on-campus students and off-campus students, key findings include the following observations:

- Approximately 80 percent of all on-campus respondents were enrolled in either a master's or specialist program, while nearly two-thirds of all off-campus respondents were enrolled in a doctoral program.
- Over 75 percent of all on-campus respondents were female. Less than 60 percent of all off-campus respondents were female. University-wide, approximately 60 percent of all enrollees are female.
- Approximately 12 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated Hispanic ethnicity. In contrast, only four percent of all off-campus respondents indicated Hispanic ethnicity.
- The invited sample was expanded in May 1996 to include all students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education attending class during Winter Term 1996, either at the University's Davie Campus or at a local cluster in Broward County. Accordingly, nearly 63 percent of all respondents were classified as on-campus students.

Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

The experience of survey respondents with technology-based instructional media is presented in Table 5. The use of electronic mail as an instructional medium was identified by over 40 percent of all off-campus respondents. In contrast, less than 30 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated experience with electronic mail.

Satisfaction With the University

Survey respondents were also presented with statements that focused on satisfaction with the University. Table 6 summarizes responses to the statement **Why did you decide to attend**

NSU? Differences in rank order and frequency of response between on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents were quite evident:

- For on-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
 - Type of Programs Available 54.3 percent
 - Convenience 53.5 percent
 - Location 46.0 percent
- For off-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
 - Convenience 65.5 percent
 - Type of Programs Available 61.5 percent
 - Location 50.9 percent

Survey respondents were also asked to identify alternates if they had not attended the University. Table 7 contrasts on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents. For on-campus respondents, over 20 percent did not select attendance at a college or university as an option had they not attended Nova Southeastern University. For off-campus respondents, over 25 percent did not select attendance at a college or university as an option had they not attended Nova Southeastern University.

Academic Programs and Student Services

The survey included statements that were directly based on accreditation criteria found in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996). Descriptive statistics for these statements are presented in Table 8, comparing on-campus respondents and their off-campus counterparts. All statements received a rating of greater than 3.0 (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic programs and student services. The highest rating (Mean = 4.5) was offered by off-campus respondents for **Opportunity for intellectual growth**. For approximately two-thirds of all Likert-statements, off-campus respondents offered higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts.

Table 1
Degree Level

DEGREE LEVEL	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
Master's	495	70.0	79	24.5
Specialist	57	8.1	21	6.5
Doctoral	120	17.0	206	64.0
Unidentified	35	4.9	16	4.9
Total	707		322	

Table 2
Gender

GENDER	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
Female	540	76.4	187	58.1
Male	161	22.8	131	40.7
Unidentified	6	0.8	4	1.2
Total	707		322	

Table 3

Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
African-American	173	24.5	72	22.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	0.3	2	0.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.1	---	---
Hispanic	81	11.5	14	4.3
White	411	58.1	223	69.3
Other	29	4.1	5	1.6
Unidentified	10	1.4	6	1.9
Total	707		322	

Table 4

Majority Place of Class Attendance

	N	%
Davie Campus or East Campus	650	62.6
Cluster Location in Broward, Dade, Monroe, or Palm Beach County	57	5.5
Cluster Location in Another Florida County	78	7.5
Cluster Location in Another State	181	17.4
Cluster Location in Another Country	17	1.6
Other	46	4.4
Missing	10	1.0
Total	1039	

Table 5
Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

RESPONSE	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
Audiobridge	147	20.8	26	8.1
Compressed Video	93	13.2	15	4.7
Electronic Mail	204	28.9	137	42.5
Electronic Classroom	59	8.3	33	10.2
Other	31	4.4	28	8.7

Table 6

Frequency of Response to Reasons for Attending Nova Southeastern University

REASONS FOR ATTENDING NSU	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Reputation	205	29.0	122	37.9
Admissions Standards	186	26.3	67	20.8
Advice of Counselors and Teachers	91	12.9	35	10.9
Availability of Scholarships or Financial Aid	67	9.5	33	10.2
Convenience	378	53.5	211	65.5
Cost	37	5.2	18	5.6
Location	325	46.0	164	50.9
Small Class Size	171	24.2	85	26.4
Social Atmosphere	47	6.6	35	10.9
Type of Programs Available	384	54.3	198	61.5
Other	62	8.8	43	13.4

Table 7

Frequency of Response to What Survey Respondents Would Have Done
if They had not Attended Nova Southeastern University

RESPONSE	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	N	%	N	%
Attended another private college or university in South Florida	182	25.7	13	4.0
Attended another private college or university in Florida but not in South Florida	5	0.7	11	3.4
Attended a private college or university in another state	22	3.1	41	12.7
Attended a state college or university in South Florida	276	39.0	34	10.6
Attended state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	26	3.7	37	11.5
Attended a state college or university in another state	38	5.4	101	31.4
Not attended a college or university	36	5.1	40	12.4
Other	14	2.0	13	4.0
Unidentified	108	15.3	32	9.9
Total	707		322	

Table 8

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

STATEMENT	ON-CAMPUS			OFF-CAMPUS		
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD
Clarity of written admission policies . . .	678	4.1	0.9	318	4.2	0.8
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	544	3.9	1.0	241	4.0	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	658	4.1	0.9	317	4.2	0.9
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	671	4.1	0.9	316	4.2	0.8
Program orientation	619	3.8	1.0	322	4.0	0.9
Length of the academic program	687	4.1	1.0	315	4.3	0.8
Length of the individual courses	684	4.2	0.8	315	4.3	0.8
Instructional methods	687	4.0	0.8	317	4.2	0.8
Delivery system	655	3.9	0.8	316	4.2	0.8
Course registration activities	678	3.8	1.0	312	4.1	0.9
Published grading policy	657	4.0	0.9	309	4.1	0.9
Interaction with administrative personnel	646	3.8	1.1	311	4.1	1.0
Competency of the faculty	680	4.0	0.9	316	4.4	0.8
Quality of the learning environment . . .	694	4.0	0.9	316	4.3	0.8
Process for assigning students to advisors	579	3.4	1.2	253	3.7	1.0
Quality of advising	624	3.5	1.1	322	3.8	1.1
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	468	3.8	1.0	255	4.2	0.9
Opportunity for intellectual growth	682	4.2	0.7	315	4.5	0.8
Faculty and student interaction	678	4.1	0.8	311	4.4	0.8
Exposure to research scholars	505	3.5	1.0	282	4.1	1.0

Table 8 (Continued)

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

STATEMENT	ON-CAMPUS			OFF-CAMPUS		
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD
Opportunity for peer interaction	666	4.2	0.8	316	4.5	0.8
Clarity of program catalog	667	4.0	0.8	313	4.1	0.8
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	592	3.9	1.0	277	3.9	1.0
Availability of library and learning resource materials	658	3.7	1.2	291	3.5	1.2
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	647	3.5	1.2	284	3.6	1.1
Orientation program relative to library services	559	3.5	1.2	275	3.3	1.1
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	568	3.5	1.1	271	3.4	1.2
Availability of computing resources . . .	584	3.8	1.0	265	3.3	1.2
Adequacy of computing resources	568	3.8	1.0	262	3.4	1.2
Access to information through technology	578	3.9	1.0	273	3.5	1.2
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	524	3.6	1.0	230	3.5	1.1
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	578	3.7	1.0	274	3.5	1.1
Provisions for training in the use of technology	539	3.6	1.1	272	3.4	1.2
Student development services	446	3.6	0.9	206	3.6	1.0
Counseling and career development . . .	439	3.5	1.0	191	3.3	1.0

Table 8 (Continued)

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

STATEMENT	ON-CAMPUS			OFF-CAMPUS		
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD
Remedial services available	327	3.4	1.0	125	3.3	1.0
Student government opportunities	296	3.4	0.9	119	3.4	1.0
Student behavior policies and procedures	455	3.8	0.8	193	3.9	0.9
Financial aid services	498	3.8	1.0	225	3.8	1.1
Health services	300	3.4	0.9	86	3.3	1.0
Alumni affairs	308	3.5	0.9	102	3.5	0.9
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	417	3.5	1.1	136	3.6	1.0
Adequacy of physical resources in classrooms	621	3.5	1.1	276	3.7	1.0
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	646	4.0	0.9	278	4.1	0.9
Overall quality of this academic program	671	4.0	0.8	306	4.3	0.8

RATING SCALE

1 Very Dissatisfied	4 Satisfied
2 Dissatisfied	5 Very Satisfied
3 Neutral, Neither Agree nor Disagree	NA Not Applicable
	U Unknown or Unable to Answer

A caution should be made that when viewing these statistics, nearly all respondents offered a numerical response to statements such as **Clarity of written admission policies** (On-campus N = 678; Off-campus N = 318), **Length of the academic program** (On-campus N = 687; Off-campus N = 315), and **Quality of the learning environment** (On-campus N = 694; Off-campus N = 316). Responses were not made at the same level to **Student government opportunities** (On-campus N = 296; Off-campus N = 119) and **Health services** (On-campus N = 300; Off-campus N = 86). Although criteria related to student government and health services may be considered important by the Southern Association of Colleges and

Schools (*Criteria for Accreditation*, 1996), adult students (the majority of respondents to this survey) obviously did not share in this level of concern and frequently selected *Not Applicable* or *Unknown or Unable to Answer* to these and similar statements that may more appropriately apply to traditional students.

DISCUSSION

When comparing responses of on-campus students and off-campus students, it is important to recall that nearly 80 percent of all on-campus respondents were enrolled in either a master's or specialist program, whereas nearly two-thirds of all off-campus respondents were enrolled in a doctoral program. Based on the sampling methodology associated with this study, this difference was expected.

As first introduced in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996), the results of these comparisons offer marked contrast to the Southern Association's traditional vision of the many benefits to residence and campus life. Off-campus respondents provided higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts for approximately two-thirds of all survey statements, including statements related to: instructional methods, delivery system, competency of the faculty, quality of the learning environment, opportunity for intellectual growth, faculty and student interaction, exposure to research scholars, and opportunity for peer interaction. Clearly, off-campus students did not perceive any significant disadvantage to residence away from campus. Instead, off-campus respondents indicated very high levels of satisfaction with the majority of the statements associated with this study. The summative statement **Overall quality of this academic program** received a higher rating from off-campus respondents (Mean = 4.3) than their on-campus counterparts (Mean = 4.0).

Although all statements received a positive rating, a close examination of Table 8 suggests that it may be useful to examine differences between on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents regarding the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure. Generally, on-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction with technology opportunities and access to information through technology than their off-campus counterparts.

Technology and the development of the University's information resource infrastructure received considerable attention in the *Master Plan* (1995) and the *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996) and for the last few years the University has vigorously upgraded this infrastructure. In 1994, the University spent nearly \$2.5 million on the computing infrastructure, with over \$1.5 million devoted exclusively to the purchase of computing equipment (*Institutional Self-Study Report*; 1996, p.269). The University continues to support and upgrade the computing infrastructure, with over \$1.5 million budgeted in Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997 exclusively for computing equipment. The Abraham S. Fischler Center

for the Advancement of Education has specifically budgeted over \$500,000 for the purchase of computing equipment in Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997.

As identified in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996), the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education uses a variety of means to increase student use of the technology-based information resource infrastructure:

- The University's Electronic Library was recently redesigned as a Web page. Now, even students with low-end machines and minimal training in the use of the Internet can enjoy the simplicity of text-based access to the many databases and information resources available at this valuable information resource, URL <<http://localhost/var/local/html/el/index.html>>.
- Telephone contact hours for the Electronic Library and the Academic Computing help desk have also been expanded, allowing all students, including students in the western United States, to receive real-time assistance on weeknights.
- Technology training opportunities for students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education have also been enhanced in a variety of ways:
 - Cluster coordinators in many distance education programs have been issued high-end computers, which they use during cluster meetings to provide training opportunities for students.
 - In some distance education programs, students have been hired to assist peer students search the University's technology-based information resource network for pertinent literature.
 - In some distance education programs, students have been hired to assist as the local technology liaison, offering support to students and reporting concerns and opportunities to campus-based faculty.
 - Permanent facilities with state-of-the-art computing machinery, secured at key off-campus locations, further enhances computing opportunities for many off-campus students. The new facility at Orlando is the most current example of the development of this enhanced technology infrastructure.
 - Technology training was pervasive at each 1996 Summer Institute, with training scheduled for all constituents: cluster coordinators, practicum and MARP advisors, and students.

It is important to emphasize that the above activities are currently in place—they are not part of a future plan. It is also important to emphasize that, overall, off-campus students indicated higher levels of satisfaction with academic program and student services than their on-campus counterparts. Finally, it may be useful to emphasize the observation in Table 5 that off-campus students currently use electronic mail (and it is assumed other technology-based information resources) with a higher degree of frequency than their on-campus counterparts. With the current level of interest and budget devoted to technology, it is not surprising that the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education was the most frequent user of the University's Electronic Library, with 15,406 entries to this information resource in Fiscal Year 1995 - 1996.

SUMMARY

This study provided contrasts between on-campus students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education and their off-campus counterparts, with focus directed to a variety of survey statements associated with the University's compliance with accreditation criteria. For nearly two-thirds of all statements, off-campus students offered higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts to issues purposely linked to accreditation criteria mandated by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Prior assumptions that the Center needs to continue to expand resources and training activities to improve access to the University's technology-based information resource network were confirmed. Although off-campus students did not express the same level of satisfaction with the University's information infrastructure as their on-campus counterparts, both groups of students indicated positive levels of satisfaction. It is anticipated that the University's current expenditure of funds for technology and technology-related training will result in greater use and satisfaction with this evolving resource.

REFERENCES

Criteria for Accreditation. (1996). Decatur, Georgia: Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us What They Think about Their University Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-02.

Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center For the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-05.

Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experiences. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-06.

Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience with Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-07.

Guidelines for Planning Distance Learning Activities. (1992). Decatur, Georgia: Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Institutional Self-Study Report. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University.

Master Plan. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-16.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-01.

Off-Campus Program Directory. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Office of Licensure and State Relations.

Place of Class Attendance at Nova Southeastern University: Calendar Years 1990 to 1994. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-03.

REFERENCES (Continued)

Quality Improvement Plans, Administrative and Educational Support Services: 1994-95. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-09.

Research and Planning Weekly Enrollment Report, April 29, 1996. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning.

South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-08.

Status Report on Institutional Effectiveness: 1994 - 1995. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-11.

Nova Southeastern University

SURVEY OF STUDENTS OF THE FISCHLER CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION

Purpose of This Survey:

As part of a continuous process of evaluation of academic programs and student services, the purpose of this survey is to determine your general level of satisfaction with your experience at the University. Results will be used to help the University provide an improved educational experience for future students.

Survey Methodology:

This survey is to be distributed to a sample of students who attend class sometime between March 25 to April 25, 1996. If by chance you receive this survey in multiple classes, please complete this survey only once.

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instructions: Check the appropriate response(s) for the following identifiers

For tracing purposes only, please identify your academic program:

- ☐ Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders
- ☐ Ed.D. Programs for Higher Education
- ☐ Ed.D. Programs in Child and Youth Studies
- ☐ Ed.D. Programs in Instructional Technology and Distance Education
- ☐ M.S. or Ed.S. Graduate Teacher Ed Program
- ☐ M.S. in Speech-Language Pathology
- ☐ M.S. Life Span Care and Administration
- ☐ M.S. Instructional Technology and Distance Education

Gender

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Ethnic Group

- ☐ African-American
- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ White
- ☐ Other _____

Where do you attend the majority of your classes?

- ☐ Davie Campus or East Campus
- ☐ North Miami Beach Campus
- ☐ Cluster Location in Broward, Dade, Monroe, or Palm Beach County
- ☐ Cluster Location in Another Florida County
- ☐ Cluster Location in Another State
- ☐ Cluster Location in Another Country
- ☐ Other _____

If you have received technology-based instruction in any of your courses, which media have you experienced?
Check all selections that apply.

- ☐ Audiobridge
- ☐ Compressed Video
- ☐ Electronic Mail
- ☐ Electronic Classroom
- ☐ Other _____

Excluding courses this term, how many courses have you completed in this academic program at the University?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ 0 courses | ☐ 5 courses |
| ☐ 1 course | ☐ 6 courses |
| ☐ 2 courses | ☐ 7 courses |
| ☐ 3 courses | ☐ 8 courses |
| ☐ 4 courses | ☐ 9 or more courses |

Please turn to the other side ➡

Why did you decide to attend NSU? Check all selections that apply.

- _____ Academic Reputation
- _____ Admissions Standards
- _____ Advice of Counselors and Teachers
- _____ Availability of Scholarships or Financial Aid
- _____ Convenience
- _____ Cost
- _____ Location
- _____ Small Class Size
- _____ Social Atmosphere
- _____ Type of Programs Available
- _____ Other_____

If you had not attended NSU, would you have attended:

- _____ Another private college or university in South Florida
- _____ Another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
- _____ A private college or university in another state
- _____ A state college or university in South Florida
- _____ A state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
- _____ A state college or university in another state
- _____ Not attended a college or university
- _____ Other_____

SECTION II: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND STUDENT SERVICES

Please review the following rating scale and then mark or circle your reaction to each statement:

RATING SCALE

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 Very Dissatisfied | 4 Satisfied |
| 2 Dissatisfied | 5 Very Satisfied |
| 3 Neutral, Neither Agree nor Disagree | NA Not Applicable |
| | U Unknown or Unable to Answer |

- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Clarity of written admission policies
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Clarity of written completion requirements
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Program orientation
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Length of the academic program
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Length of the individual courses
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Instructional methods
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Delivery system
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Course registration activities
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Published grading policy
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Interaction with administrative personnel
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Competency of the faculty

- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Quality of the learning environment
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Process for assigning students to advisors
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Quality of advising
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Opportunity for intellectual growth
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Faculty and student interaction
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Exposure to research scholars
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Opportunity for peer interaction
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Clarity of program catalog
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Correctness of student records (including transcripts)
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Availability of library and learning resource materials
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Adequacy of library and learning resource materials
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Orientation program relative to library services
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Training in access to information in electronic and other formats
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Availability of computing resources
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Adequacy of computing resources
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Access to information through technology
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Infusion of information technology into the curricula
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Provisions for training in the use of technology
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Student development services
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Counseling and career development
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Remedial services available
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Student government opportunities
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Student behavior policies and procedures
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Financial aid services
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Health services
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Alumni affairs
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Refund policies when withdrawing from courses
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Adequacy of physical resources in classrooms
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment
- 1 2 3 4 5 NA U Overall quality of this academic program

For tracking purposes only, please list:

- _____ The number of this course
- _____ Today's date



RESEARCH AND PLANNING
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314-7796